



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Iliad, edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by WALTER LEAF, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Vol. I, Books I-XII, XXVIII, 422. Macmillan & Co., 1886.

The rapidity with which editions of Homer are given to the world is, perhaps, no longer so adequate a criterion of the vigor of philological life as it was, for example, between 1525 and 1606, when no less than sixteen complete editions in Germany attest the zeal of the Humanists. The significance of this *magnus proventus* is obvious when we contrast such a season of fruitfulness with that sterile age between 1606 and 1759 (the date of Ernesti's text), which gave birth to but a single edition. The last decennium has been more fruitful than perhaps any other in the history of Homeric investigation; and if we take into consideration the boldness of its criticism, aiming not merely at the reconstruction of a text antedating the supposed recension of Pisistratus, but even at the establishment of an Aiolic Homer, and the more cautious attempts at distinguishing the Aristarchean from the vulgate text, we must award to it the palm of superiority over many of its fellows. An eminent English scholar has even asserted that the ultimate influence of a recent edition will be comparable to the influence exercised by the *Prolegomena* of Wolf.

Some recent German editions, notably that of Fäsi, under the hands of the late Dr. Hinrichs, have gradually become the representatives of more special lines of criticism; and while English and American scholars have been waiting for the authoritative utterances of the best English criticism in an *editio critica* from the Provost of Oriel, Mr. Leaf has drawn his *vñ̃a μέλαιναν* (the *atramentum* of Lobeck) *εἰς ἅλα διαν*, and produced an edition which professes allegiance to no single one of the many methods designed to initiate the neophyte into the mysteries attendant upon the critical study of the epopee. Though Mr. Leaf is not of the persuasion that the soul of Homer, after years of Pythagorean metempsychosis, transmigrated into the body of Aristarchus only to be subjected to a renewed birth in Lehrs, he is, nevertheless, an adherent of that form of Königsbergerism of which Ludwig is the *πρόμαχος*, honoring the memory of the "mighty master" by maintaining a vigorous warfare against that school of criticism which refuses to return from its *schwindelnden Höhen auf den festen Boden der Wirklichkeit*—a reality to be found in the utterances of tradition alone.

The probability of the critic's attaining his ultimate goal in the restoration of the primitive form of the Iliad appears to Mr. Leaf so far distant, that notwithstanding traces are manifest of an inclination to suffer the ingression of antique forms, he establishes the earliest tradition as the canon of criticism by which he estimates the value of every reading. This method, a commonplace among conservative critics, is tinged with an admixture of radicalism in the case of our editor, who is not content with an attempt at reproducing the text of Aristarchus, but aims at producing an Iliad approximately identical

with that from which Thucydides, Herodotus, or even Pindar drew their inspiration. He assures us that we are so fortunate as to be able to carry tradition back from our present vulgate to the text of Antimachus of Colophon, whose "floruit" lies in the middle or perhaps end of the fifth century. The text of the author of the Thebais he claims to be identical with the *vulgata* emended by Aristarchus, and holds that we may with safety draw the conclusion that the Antimachean text, differing from the vulgate to no greater degree than an indifferent MS differs from a good one, was approximately the same as that which was authoritative in the age of Pericles. While we would fain believe that the strength of the chain of evidence that makes for this conclusion has not been underestimated by us, we must take issue with our editor as regards the approximate certainty with which this pre-Euclidean text can be reproduced. The ultimate significance of Mr. Leaf's assertion that tradition, in preserving the name of Antimachus, has ensured our possessing a text upon which we may rely as the *vulgata* of the fifth century, may excuse a very brief discussion of a few arguments that serve to show that the practical possibility of establishing such a canon as the best tradition of the fifth century is far less than Mr. Leaf seems to imagine. These arguments, fortified by the results of some of the latest researches on the subject, deal with relations of Aristarchus to his sources, a problem bristling with difficulties, which in turn are enhanced by our ignorance of the exact position occupied by Didymus in regard to his sources. Recent research, in increasing our scepticism of the possibility of ever unveiling the mystery in which the pre-Aristarchean MSS are involved, has confirmed much that had been conjectured in a former period of Homeric investigation.

If Aristarchus actually made use of ἡ κατὰ Ἀντίμαχον, as is generally supposed, it can never be proved that he possessed the original MS. *Græcia mendax*, in supplying the ever-growing zeal of the Alexandrians for a complete collection of codices, may have passed off on the unsuspecting Samothracian MSS of an unblushing lack of authenticity. This is, however, an uncontrollable factor for us moderns. It is at least doubtful whether Aristarchus had any knowledge of so important a codex as the ἡ ἐκ νάρθηκος of Aristotle and of the ἐκδοσις of Euripides, which was in all probability pre-Euclidean. Of the date and character of the Μασσαλιωτική, of which it is probable that but one text existed, and of the Χία, of the Ἀργολική<sup>1</sup> (perhaps the work of *philologunculi*) we know practically nothing, though it is possible that they were included in Aristarchus' *apparatus criticus*. Ludwig's statement that Aristarchus himself was unable to date these MSS has not been supported by its author. The Königsberg scholar has, however, done no mean service in attempting to raise a bulwark of negative facts against that *gaukelndes Spiel ausschweifendster Phantasie* which seeks *de suo* to determine the original source of the older editions in the possession of Aristarchus. Equally vain as in the

<sup>1</sup> Römer (Die Homerrecension des Zenodot, 1885) well says that these MSS appear consecrated by the centuries to the innocent layman on first hearing their names. *Wie würde unsre heutige Philologie diese heiligen Urzeugen . . . ausgenützt haben?* (p. 24). The course of Homeric research has proved that the antiquity of these MSS is very doubtful; and with this doubt disappears our veneration for their authority. Aristarchus was no believer in these mysterious MSS, adopting but five or six out of the twenty-nine readings cited from the Massiliensis and none from the Χία. Some of the MSS Römer thinks may not be antecedent to Zenodotus.

case of the *Μασσαλιωτική* are the efforts to date any of the *κατὰ πόλεις* editions. Düntzer imagined himself able to pierce the obscurity surrounding the earlier editions, and was led to the conclusion: *von den Abschriften des wohl im Perserkriege untergegangenen Staatsexemplars waren die alexandrinischen Kritiker mittel- oder unmittelbar abhängig*. It would be difficult to find in the entire range of Homeric research an assertion less supported by facts than this. As well operate with the "edition of Pisistratus" as draw conclusions from so reckless a statement.

Vital to the correctness of Mr. Leaf's theory of the continuity of tradition is the assumption that the *κοινὰ ἐκδόσεις* represent a pre-Aristarchean vulgate, one text differing inconsiderably in its details from another, but bearing at least no trace of those vast textual revolutions undergone by the epos in the distant past. The *κοινὰ* are constantly contrasted by the scholia with the text of Aristarchus. But I have been able to discover no cogent argument in Ludwig's volume that demonstrates indisputably that they were older than *αἱ Ἀριστάρχων*. While even the actual significance of the term *κοινὰ* is a battleground of critics (Nitzsch, Kayser and others held views diametrically opposed to those of the Königsberg scholar), it cannot but seem to some uncritical to push to the extreme the evidence in favor of a pre-Aristarchean vulgate, especially when we claim to find its earliest representative in a text about which our knowledge is elusive, though Mr. Leaf holds it to be essentially identical with the Attic recension of the fifth century. Though personally we incline to the opinion that there existed both pre-Aristarchean and post-Aristarchean *κοινὰ*, yet no desire to elevate a mere probability into a possible reality can make us fail to see that there is but little warranty for regarding *ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* as its earliest traceable form. *Ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* is referred to in the scholia A 298, 424, 598, E 461,<sup>1</sup> N 60, Ψ 870, α 85 and its *quisquiliæ* rejected by Aristarchus in the three latter instances. Is the logic of the philologist reduced to such a pass that it must confess itself so thoroughgoing an adherent of the *argumentum ex silentio* as to believe that the Antimachean edition varied from the *κοινὴ* in but such a trifling number of instances?<sup>2</sup>—even though Aristarchus is said to have adduced *variae lectiones* only when his critical sagacity impugned their value so far as to refuse them admission into his text. If we bind ourselves to this species of argumentation we may reproduce the text of the vulgate of the fifth century, but we reproduce it unconsciously. The citation of four passages of agreement between the edition of Antimachus and the *κοινὴ* no more affords an opportunity for critical combinations than the agreement of *ἡ Σινωπική* with *ἡ Ἀντιμάχου* on A 298, 424, E 461, or with *ἡ Ἀριστάρχειος* A 298, 424, 435, or its difference from the last named, B 258, permits us to form a conclusion as to the character of the entire text, even though we heap together all our little knowledge of the principles of Homeric criticism in the Ptolemaic age.<sup>3</sup> Will any one assert that we should be justified

<sup>1</sup> "Τρῳάς" ἐν τῇ . . . Ἀντιμάχου. ἡ μέντοι κοινὴ . . . "Τρῳάς."

<sup>2</sup> It is unfortunate that there is no citation from Theagenes of Rhegium in the scholia, otherwise Mr. Leaf might have carried his tradition back to the sixth century.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Römer (p. 12): *Wenn auch Aristarch über den wirklichen und vorliegenden Textbestand vollständig im Klaren, so war er über die Gründe, die seine Vorgänger zu Aenderungen, Athetesen, Interpolationen bestimmten fast vollständig im Dunkeln und musste denselben meistens durch Combinationen zu erwägen suchen und hat da auch manchmal fehlgegriffen*. Cf. also Mr. Leaf *ad* E 249, 791, and Römer, p. 9.

in forming conclusions as to the value and position of the (uncollated) Venetus B, No. 453, if we possessed but seven citations from it? Possibilities without number present themselves to the critic desirous of founding a Periclean text, but it is safer to confess the limitations of our acquaintance with pre-Aristarchean tradition than to enshrine the edition of Choerilus' contemporary (whose birthplace, Clarus, does not presage much for his authoritativeness in reproducing an Attic vulgate) in the exalted position of being the earliest known form of the *κοινή*.

And again: though the fantastic conception of Aristarchus that Homer was an Athenian<sup>1</sup> may invalidate much of his authority as a conservative adherent of ancient tradition, it cannot be denied that thereby there is a greater probability that his text approaches the Attic text more closely than any of the *κατὰ πόλεις* editions, if we believe with Ritschl that the latter were *die Urschriften localer Textrecensionen*, an assumption that can neither be proved nor gainsaid. The critical labors of Aristarchus are assumed to have interrupted the current of *κοινή* tradition, as, to draw a parallel from another department of Greek life, the philosophical theories of Plato and Aristotle were but brilliant interruptions to the advance of those doctrines of the pre-Socratic philosophers which again came to the front in the speculation of the Epicurean and Stoic schools. But the critical activity of the successor of Aristophanes was not confined to the *coniecturalis emendatio*. It attempted, as Zenodotus, the godfather of the 'Ομηρικοί, had in vain attempted before him, to stem the current against a corrupt vulgate upon the basis of a critical apparatus which must have increased in authority after the period of Zenodotus. His MSS must have varied very considerably from the vulgate text, but of them we know practically nothing. If ἡ Ἀντιμάχειος had been equipollent to the Attic vulgate of the fifth century, and Aristarchus had possessed a good copy, we should expect to find at least a sporadic reference in the scholia to the value of such a venerable authority. But there is everywhere darkness visible on this point. Of all the grounds that seem worth the sober attention of the critic, I can see none that identifies the Antimachean edition with that of the vulgate; nor do I recollect to have seen any assertion by Ludwich, on whose researches Mr. Leaf bases his conclusions, that such was the case. When we have obtained the all-important information whence came the MSS in Aristarchus' apparatus, what was their date, etc., then we can cease dealing with *x*, *y* and *z*. Mr. Leaf (cf. p. xiv) intimates correctly enough that Aristarchus did not always know what the best tradition was, and that he occasionally rejected it, when known, from preconceived notions.<sup>2</sup> Hence, when Aristarchus departs from the best tradition of the fifth century Mr. Leaf must reject his readings. But his representative of this best tradition is a vulgate which keeps itself invisible in its tents only to appear victoriously on four occasions. If a successful restoration of the Aristarchean text is dependent upon no inconsiderable number of preliminary investigations in reference to the methods of Didymus, which even Ludwich has not solved without peradventure, how great must be the difficulties in the

<sup>1</sup> Hence the form *οὖν*, a form found in the Attic dialect alone.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Leaf frequently rejects the Aristarchean readings, e. g. Γ 368 MSS οὐδ' ἐβαλὼν μιν, A. οὐδὲ δάμασσα, on the ground that βάλλω was used only of a blow of a missile; Γ 352 MSS δάμασσον, A. δαμῆναι; Θ 526 Arist. εὐχομαι ἐλπομένος, where Zenod. ἐλπ. εὐχ. is preferable, despite Römer's objections; I 509 MSS εὐξομένοιο, A. εὐχομένοιο—the present part. means "boasting"; cf. also I 564, 602 *et pass.*

reproduction of a text antedating that of Aristarchus by almost three centuries! The highest aim of scholars of the traditional school is, then, to restore the text of Aristarchus, since it is impossible from the knowledge of pre-Aristarchean sources at our command to define the exact form of any text antecedent to that of the great Alexandrian.

In further confirmation of our inability to restore the Homer of Thucydides or even of Pindar, or (here another *motif* comes to light) "perhaps even a critically better text than any which in their uncritical time had been composed from the existing but scattered materials" (is Mr. Leaf a Paleyite?), may be cited the well-known argument drawn from the variations in the geographers and philosophers. The reasons for those of the geographers are self-evident; but when Mr. Leaf makes the sweeping statement that the variations in the classical authors are "seldom of importance," we think he has underestimated their value. In themselves these variants may not be of great significance, but the existence of no less than about forty variants in Plato and Aristotle each cannot be accounted for by the difference between the requirements of the ancient and the modern world in regard to the verbal accuracy of quotation. These variants show that there must have been other texts in existence besides an assumed *vulgata*; a conclusion that is not impugned by the fact that Didymus fails to make use of this material. Thucydides' citation of the Hymns is remarkable, and passages disappeared from the *vulgata* even before the second century B. C. (e. g. I 448-461).

The interesting question whether or no the Alexandrian savants possessed pre-Euclidean MSS, a most important factor in the problem of the restoration of a text of the fifth century, is unfortunately not referred to by our editor. If it is true<sup>1</sup> that the earliest notice which appears to preserve a trace of the existence of MSS in the *ἀρχαία συνθήχεια* (Aristonicus *ad* Δ 104: *Ζηρόδοτος γράφει "ὅν ποτ' Ἀχιλλεύς."* μήποτε δὲ πεπλάνηται, γεγραμμένον τοῦ ὁ ὑπ' ἀρχαϊκῆς σημασίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ὦ, προσθεῖς τὸ ν) is a mere conjecture, and that all other references (e. g. H 238, a 52, 254; cf. Ξ 241) rest upon a foundation even more insecure, we can reject as undemonstrable the assertion of Cobet (*Misc. Crit.* 289) that Zenodotus transcribed *εἰς τὰ Ἰωνικὰ γράμματα* MSS written *γράμμασιν Ἀττικαῖς*. As the question needs a renewed ventilation I give a collection of passages involving the letters E and O, which serves to show that Aristarchus, and *a fortiori* Didymus, did not possess any MSS in the *παλαιὰ γραμματική*.<sup>2</sup>

I. H, not E.

1. A 298 *μαχίσσομαι εἵνεκα κούρης*: οὕτως διὰ τοῦ η, οὐ διὰ τοῦ ες, καὶ ἡ *Μασσα-λωτική* καὶ ἡ *Ἀργολική* καὶ ἡ *Σινωπική* καὶ ἡ *Ἀντιμάχου*. In the MSS stood MAXHΣOMAI, not MAXEE(Σ)OMAI. Cf. Schol. *ad* B 377.

2. A 381 *ἥεν*: HEN in ἡ *Κυπρία* and in ἡ *Κρητική*, which perhaps never came under the cognizance of Aristarchus, as it is mentioned by Seleucus alone on this passage.

3. Γ 10 *ἦντε ὄρευσ*, in the *Χία* and *Μασσ.* and in "certain others," is held by Mr. Leaf to be an error for *ἦντ' ὄρευσ*. All the other MSS with the exception of G have *εὔτε*, with which our editor well compares the uses of "as." The schol. have *διὰ τοῦ ε αἱ Ἀριστάρχου τὸ εὔτε*. The *Χία* had HYTE, not ETTE.

<sup>1</sup> See Ludwich's *Aristarch's Homerische Textkritik*, p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> See Giese's *Der aeolische Dialekt*, 1837, §14.

4. T 117 ὁ δ' ἐβδομος ἐσθήκει μείς. ἐν τῇ Χία μής. Giese suggests that μής may be a dialectical form and not one reading of ΜΕΣ, the other being μείς.

5. B 258 ἡ δὲ Σινωπικὴ εἶχε "κικήσομαι."

6. Φ 11 ἐννεον: ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις "νήχοντ'."

7. Ω 82 κῆρα: "πῆμα" ἐναι τῶν κ. Cf. also schol. ad B 53, 415, Π 127.

II. EI, not E.

1. A 97 ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀπώσσει, not "ἀεκέα" ἡ Μασσ., etc.

2. A 585 ἐν χειρὶ τίθει, not "χερσί" ἡ Μ., etc.

3. Γ 51 κατηφείην, not κατηφείη (as Zenod.).

4. Σ 538 εἶμα δ' ἐχ': ἐν τῇ Μ. "εἶμά τ' ἔχε."

5. T 56 ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον: ἐν τῇ Χία "ὄνειαρ," ἐγγέγραπτο, ἐν τῇ Μ. "ἀμεινον."

6. T 76 ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων: ἐν δὲ τῇ Μ. καὶ Χία "κρείων."

7. Ω 192 ἡ δὲ Μ. πολλὰ κεκεύθει. The schol. has been emended to οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος "κεχάνθει" διὰ τοῦ εἰ.

8. O 44 ἐν—καὶ Μ. καὶ Ἀργολικῇ οὕτως ἐφέρετο "κτεινομένους δ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἰδῶν."

9. Φ 86 ἀνάσσει: ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις "ἄνασσε."

III. HI, not EI.

1. I 639 ἐπὶ τῇσι: οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇσι "ἐν ἀπάσαις, ἐπὶ ταῖς Λεσβίσι." ἀπασαὶ διορθώσεις is an expression of the epitomists to signify both the two editions of Aristarchus and all others with which his agreed in any given case.

2. X 51 παιδὶ γέρον: αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "παιδὶ φίλῃ."

3. X 93 μένησι: "δοκεύν" ἐναι τῶν κατὰ πόλεις.

4. O 18 μέμνη: διὰ τοῦ η εἶχον πάσαι. Cf. also K 346.

IV. Ω, not O.

1. A 97 ἀπώσσει: ἡ Μασσαλιωτικῇ.

2. Π 127 ἰωήν: ἐν τῇ Μ. "ἐρωήν."

3. N 60 κεκοπώς: ἐν δὲ τῇ Χία καὶ Ἀντιμάχου "κεκοπών."

4. Υ 188 βοῶν ἀπο: ἐν τῇ Χία "βοῶν ἔπει."

5. T 386 τῷ δ' εὐτε: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "τῶν δ' αὐτε."

6. Φ 454 τηλεδαπών: αἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων "θηλυτερῶν."

7. Υ 308 γένωνται: αἱ διὰ τῶν πόλεων "λίπωνται."

8. α 52 Ἀτλαντος θυγάτηρ Ὀλοόφρωνος, ὃς τε θαλάσσης: . . . ἡ ἐγγέγραπτο κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφὴν [ΟΛΟΟΦΡΟΝ, i. e. Ὀλοόφρων], εἰτά τις μὴ νοήτας προσέθηκε τὸ ὄ. Schwerlich mehr als eine misslungene Conjectur: Ludwig. The ὃς of the relative clause was the cause of the difficulty. The grammarians merely used their knowledge of the existence of γράμματα Ἀττικά as a means of explaining forms which presented difficulties to them.<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Ω 30, Φ 88, Υ 62.

V. ΩΙ, not ΟΙ.

A 598 ζῖνοχρεῖ: οὕτως "οἶνοχρεῖ" Ἀρίσταρχος, Ἰακῶς καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀργολικῇ καὶ Μ. καὶ Ἀντιμαχεῖω κτλ.

VI. ΟΥ, not O.

1. Υ 62 ἐκ θρόνου ἄλτο: ἐν ἄλλῳ "ἐκ θρόνου ὥρτο." οὕτως καὶ ἡ Μ.

2. Ω 109 ὀτρίνεσκον: ἡ Μ. "ὀτρίνουσιν." οὕτως καὶ ἡ Χία.

3. B 53 βουλήν: αἱ πλείους καὶ χαριέσται "βουλή." Cf. also B 347.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. § 204 Κάστωρ: Καλλίστρατος ἐν τῇ ἐκ Μουσείου "Καστῶρ" φησὶ γεγράφθαι may record the existence of a *var. lect.* (Ἀκτωρ? or Κάτωρ?) and need not have been caused by ΑΣΤΩΡ. The interchange in the MSS of ο and ω (e. g. 10 times in A, 27 times in B) cannot be held as an argument for the influence of a pre-Euclidean alphabet.

Lastly, it should be mentioned that there was no sign for the spiritus asper in these MSS, H representing  $\eta$ . Both ' and the accents were introduced by the Alexandrians. The *κοινὰ* MSS too show no trace of confusion between  $\epsilon\iota$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\epsilon$  and  $\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\omicron\iota$ .

All these readings containing  $\epsilon\iota$ ,  $\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\eta$ , cited from the MSS, came down to Didymus through the medium of copies. While, therefore, the proof of our position is perhaps in some instances difficult, there is no inconsiderable amount of testimony in the above citations which shows the Alexandrians not to have possessed pre-Euclidean MSS.

We have already seen that our knowledge of Antimachus' edition is too unsatisfactory to regard it as the forerunner of a long series of *vulgate* texts. The above collection of passages shows that there is an element of uncertainty in any attempt to restore a reading of the fifth century, since our supposed vulgate, even if emended by Aristarchus, was ultimately based upon MSS which may have contained false transcriptions of E and O sounds (cf. B 300 and schol.). We cannot, therefore, determine absolutely whether the Attic text of the fifth century had  $\mu\alpha\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  or  $\mu\alpha\chi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  A 298. Heracleon wrote the latter. We are gratified to see that Mr. Leaf writes  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\acute{\eta}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  K 97,  $\beta\acute{\eta}\omega$  Z 113; why not then  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\acute{\eta}\alpha\tau\omicron$  M 179, when on the one hand we have  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\chi\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ , and on the other the possibility that it is incorrectly transcribed with  $\epsilon\iota$  instead of  $\eta$  from  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\chi\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron$ ? Why then not write  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  A 23, since  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha\iota$  cannot be original and was not the genuine reading of the fifth century? Christ's arguments are not sufficiently cogent to justify a Hellenic subj. in  $-\omega$ : we read, therefore,  $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\epsilon$  H 72, where all MSS have  $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$ . Mr. Leaf has  $\delta\alpha\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\epsilon$  here, but  $\delta\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\varsigma$  Γ 436. We find that our editor reads  $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  Γ 441 despite  $\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\pi}\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ . He confesses his adherence to the old and questionable etymology of  $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\chi\alpha\tau\alpha\iota$  from  $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\nu\eta\mu\iota$ , and does not even mention the plausible proposition of Leo Meyer to refer it to  $\delta\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\alpha\tau\iota$  and write with  $\eta$ . I can see no reason for an intensive formation here. I regard the explanation of  $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  given on I 196 from  $\delta\epsilon\iota-\delta\iota\kappa-\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  as incorrect. There are no genuine instances of a reduplicating syllable  $\epsilon\iota$  in the perfect. 'Αδελφεό, ὄο, ἤγγρετο (H 434) have been relegated to the notes because the "traditional reading is not, on the face of it, unmetrical, as in the case of 'Ἰφίτων B 518, 'Ἀσκληπίου B 731." We respect Mr. Leaf's scrupulous conscience, but wish that the mere fact that  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon$  is metrical had not deterred him from adopting Ahrens' conjecture, especially as  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  occurs thirteen times. The same veneration for the *littera scripta* has perpetuated the life of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ , a *peccatum ab origine*, on the analogy of the "traditional"  $\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ , a form as unjustifiable as  $\delta\pi\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  T 172. Granting an editor of the Iliad all the conservatism he demands in rejecting etymologies which savor of excessive boldness (though Mr. Leaf's identification (Z 321) of  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\omega$  through  $sa$  and  $sa + m$  ( $sm$ ) will not strike a modern etymologist as being dictated by great caution), it is difficult to agree with his position, when, with the possibility of false transcription staring him in the face, he nevertheless prefers bad, nay impossible Greek to good Greek because the former has been anointed by the unction of "tradition." Not even "Old John Naps of Greece" ever beheld such forms as are constantly embalmed in our editions of Homer. But Mr. Leaf's adherence to tradition is, however, not unlikely to win the favor of all

except those whose bolder aim seeks to rid a long-suffering text from the ignorance of luckless wights of transcribers. In B 617 Mr. Leaf has even failed to follow "tradition." He should have read Ἀλήσιον, the epichoristic name as attested by an Elean inscription and by Eustathius *ad loc.* and by Steph. Byz. *ad* Δ 757 (where Mr. L. and Rzach Ἀλεισίον, La R. Ἀλισίον). If the dangers of incorrect transcription are not sufficient to deter an editor from his reproduction of non-Hellenic forms, the wavering orthography of the time of Aristarchus, not to speak of that of Didymus, might have been effective. A glance at Schaefer's Gregorius Corinthus or the second edition of Blass' *Ausprache des Griechischen* ought to remove the scruples even of the most scrupulous.

A difference from the ordinary text claimed by Mr. Leaf for his edition is his reproduction of the diaeresized form in Πηλείδης. He, however, writes Ἀργεῖος and everywhere εἰ in the middle of a word except in the patronymics. This is correct, as I have shown in my treatise (Der Diphthong EI) that there was a gradual demise of εἰ from εσι. The editors of the tragedians do not follow the same rule in the case of the patronymics. Πηλείδης is not necessary, but facilitates the flow of the dactylic rhythm. Cf. Agam. 123, Antig. 982, Med. 824 and Menrad *De contractionis et synizeseos usu Hom.*, 1886, p. 64.

ἱπεραῖ Δ 297, νηλεῖ E 330, show that Mr. Leaf is of the opinion that the διάστας in the dat. loc. in the Hom. text held good to the Peloponnesian war. In the above-cited paper (p. 25 *seqq.*) I have shown that even in the melic and iambographic poets the majority of forms refuse to admit the open form in this case; and in Attic it is extremely rare, if occurring at all, from -ες stems. εἰρεῖ πάντῳ Trach. 114, an -εῦ stem, is an epic reminiscence. How does Mr. Leaf propose to prove that in the Homer of Thucydides εἰ was read in the dative? Certainly his MS authority does not support his readings in any great number of instances (cf. La Roche's Textkritik for the signification of the two dots placed over the ε of εἰ in the MSS), and the balance of probability inclines us to the belief that the number of spondaic verses was greater in the fifth than in any preceding century.

The limits set to this review preclude the possibility of any discussion of the conclusions which our editor has reached in his examination of the structure and history of the Homeric poems. It may, however, be stated that he athetizes in the text but 63 lines in A-M. There remains then the pleasant duty of offering to him our congratulations upon the character of his editorial work, which he has performed so felicitously as to entitle him to the gratitude of all Homeric scholars. If in the preceding portion of this review we have had occasion to cast some doubts upon the degree of probability to be attained in restoring even approximately a pre-Euclidean text, and to demand the exercise of greater caution in dealing with the sources of information at our command, our dissent on that point must only serve to emphasize our cordial appreciation of his every page, from which we have drawn no little instruction. Mr. Leaf is too much a believer that *le moi est haïssable*, except where he refers to his work in the Journ. Hellen. Studies. Content to leave unspecified whatever improvements may have been the result of his own acumen, his edition testifies to a more extended acquaintance with recent German criticism than we are wont to find among English scholars; and the *naïveté* which

prompted the remark of an English editor of the *Iliad*—that he had read Wolf's *Prolegomena*—finds no place in a book which bears evidence of painstaking individual work and general sobriety of judgment.

The devotion of this edition to the guidance of tradition has prevented Mr. Leaf from yielding to the allurements of the *divina ars coniectandi*, which are, perhaps, more seductive in the case of Homer than in that of any other classic. If we may hazard a conjecture, our editor is more sympathetically inclined to the rigorous grammatical criticism of the Dutch than to the brilliant fertility of the St. Petersburg school, whose estimation of the lucubrations of Aristarchus as *ineptiae* severs it from English methods of Homeric criticism by a wide chasm. In citing the readings of Zenodotus we miss any attempt to explain the cause of the variants. Mr. Leaf has relegated to the notes all emendations of the text (except those mentioned on page 7). These consist of attempts to restore *F* (the two-edged sword of criticism) and, rarely, more exact grammatical construction (e. g. A 125, with Mr. Monro, ἀλλά θ' ἂ μὲν). No effort is made at a complete restoration of the *F*, and obvious conjectures are frequently passed by, e. g. Γ 351 ὁ με πρότερος κάκ' ἔρεξε. When a conjecture like Nauck's ἀκλεές (M 318) appears to have some support in tradition (ἀκλεές δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος κατὰ συγκοπήν), Mr. Leaf does not hesitate to adopt a form which comparative grammar proves to have been original. Such occurrences are, however, rare.

In comparison with editions such as those of Nauck, Fick, Christ, Rzach, which aim at purifying the text of linguistic *horrenda*, or even at reconstructing an original Homer, Mr. Leaf's text has a humbler aspiration. It represents no essential advance upon the text of the school-edition of Ameis-Hentze, and, measured by the radical tendencies in Homeric criticism which have undoubtedly gained ground since the appearance of Nauck's recension, marks a positive retrogression. Thus Mr. Leaf will not even remove the ν ἐφελκυστικόν in ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστος because he has no MS "authority, which, however unconsciously, retains the tradition of a lost *F*," though, from love of the ictus-theory of Fick, he justifies (on E 293) the Göttingen professor's bolder procedure in expelling the parasitic letter. Nor will he attempt to restore -οισι, e. g. in Γ 331 ἀργυρέουσιν ἐπισφύριους ἀραρνίας, though we cannot be sure that -οισι was not the older termination or that -οισι was not felt as the ending by the Athenians of the fifth century, who preserved it till Ol. 86, 3 (though, perhaps, as a form savoring of legal phraseology, as in the latest example Ol. 83, 4 Ἀθηναίοισι, CIA IV 25). Mr. Leaf can, however, comfort himself with the thought that he has manuscript testimony in his favor, despite the fact that the writer has himself materially reduced the number of cases of the occurrence of -οις in Homer below that to which they were emended by Nauck in the third volume of the *Mél. gr.-rom.*

But even if the edition before us offer no advance upon the traditional text, which has proved an eyesore to a generation of scholars trained to new conceptions of the dignity of Homeric research, it has its obvious justification. As well grant a Scotchman his premises and then dispute the correctness of his logic, as differ with an editor of Homer who does not adopt readings which, at the outset, were not in harmony with the plan of his text. Mr. Leaf has done sufficient service to the cause of Homeric scholarship if he alone confines his labors to the successful explanation of a vulgate text.

It will be impossible here to extend to Mr. Leaf's edition that richly merited courtesy of an expression of opinion in reference both to the many points of interpretation in which we have taken the liberty of differing from him, and to those felicitous explanations of crucial passages in which his volume abounds. A cursory examination of some few passages in Γ must suffice in place of a thoroughgoing treatment of all.

Γ 18. Mr. Leaf writes *αὐτὰρ ὁ* against the authority of the critics of antiquity, and quotes Didymus to show that Homer frequently employs phrases like *ὁ δὲ*, etc., without any change of subject. I cannot accept A 191 as an "appropriate instance." *ἡ ὁ γε φάσγανον ὄξυ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ | τοὺς μὲν ἀναστήσειεν, ὁ δ' Ἀτρεΐδην ἐναρίζοι* contains a well-defined contrast with *τοὺς μὲν*. Cf. also ν 219. In our passage there is neither any such contrast nor is there any special emphasis laid upon the subject as in A 191.

Γ 22. *βιβάντα* is read by Mr. L.: "omni caret librorum auctoritate," La Roche. *βιβῶντα* is therefore the correct reading here (so G. Curtius). *βίβημι* passed over to *βιβάω*.

Γ 23. The explanation of *πεινῶν*, in which Mr. Leaf coincides with Nägelsbach, is well adapted to the character of Γ, which might be called the *Book of Revenge*.

Γ 26. Since both of the two etymologies quoted for *αἰζηοί* (abhi-jāva, *ἀρι* + *ζη*) contradict the laws of comparative philology, they should have been omitted.

Γ 54. The significant absence of the deictic article before *κίθαρις* might well have been noticed.

Γ 57. *λαῖνον ἔσσο*: A case of neglected *F* according to Mr. L. But *λαῖνον* is permissible, as *αι* from *aFi* is Homeric as well as *ai* (cf. *παῖς*, *παῖς*). MS authority avails little here. Read either *λαῖνον ἔεσσο* or *λαῖνον ἔφεσσο*, of which a trace may perhaps be seen in *εἶσο* in the MSS. It may be remarked in passing that, so far as I remember, I have found no reference in Mr. Leaf's book to the theory of Hartel (whose *Studien* are mentioned twice in the notes on Δ and once in those on Ε) in reference to the vocalization of *F*, which would clear up such *unica* as *ἐκηβόλω* A 438, *ὄν* 609, *οἱ* E 338, the "only line in the Iliad in which there is no easy emendation which will restore *F* to *οἱ*"; cf. Z 90. Mr. Leaf does not mention the absence of *F* in *Ἥλις*.

Γ 318 *λαοὶ δ' ἡρήσαντο, θεοῖσι δὲ χεῖρας ἀνέσχον*. Though the reason adduced in favor of Nicanor's reading (*ἡρήσαντο θεοῖς ἰδὲ χ. ἀ.*) may be "frivolous," there is an argument in its favor which has been overlooked by Mr. L. If a verb of prayer (*ἁρᾶσθαι* or *εὐχεσθαι*) is joined with *χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν* the dative (the god) belongs with the verb of prayer, *e. g.* T 254. *χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν* governs the dative only when there is no verb like *εὐχεσθαι* in the sentence, *e. g.* Z 257. See Ameis-Hentze.

Γ 334. Mr. L. might have noticed that *τερσανόεσσαν* = *θυσανόεσσαν* of Zenodotus' reading is un-Homeric. *θυσαν.* is used of the aegis alone.

Γ 348. "H. always uses *χαλκός* of weapons of offence, not of the shield," *i. e.* in case *χαλκός* is used *by itself*.

Γ 367. I think Mr. Leaf will find it difficult to discover any trace of a *√ Fayγ* which shall explain *ἑᾶγγν*. There is no evidence whatsoever for such a root in Greek or in any cognate language, so far as I remember. It is at least safer, if not entirely satisfactory, to explain *ἑᾶγγν* from *\*ἡῶγγν*; cf. *ἑῶλιν* from

\*ἡῶλων, βασιλῆα from βασιλέᾱ. Mr. Leaf himself seems to accept the explanation of ἡα from ἑᾱ (cf. Δ 321), which is perhaps different from ἑῶλην. On E 487 Mr. Leaf holds that ἑαλων is a case of double augment.

As Lange and Monro (the latter to too great an extent) are made responsible for no inconsiderable portion of the notes on syntax, though it should be stated that Mr. Leaf aims to take truth for authority and not authority for truth, we deem it best to limit our criticism to that portion of his volume in which he has not achieved equal success, especially as an anticipatory notice (A. J. P. VII 271) has already referred to several syntactical inaccuracies.

Though it may seem unreasonable to demand of an editor of the Iliad so intimate an acquaintance with those contemporary views of I.-E. vocalization which have upset the authority of Curtius, as to avoid speaking of a root *var* A 356, *man* B 484, or of *ishirds* for *isaras* A 366 (see Osthoff, M. U. IV 151), etc., we feel that it is surely no injustice to expect that his etymological horizon should not be practically restricted to that of Curtius. In the department of etymology the English seem to be *laudatores unius hominis*: him they enthrone for a generation until another luminary appear. The appearance of the second English edition of Curtius' *Grundzüge* is destined to retard, by a decennium at least, the dissemination of many true conceptions of Greek morphological laws. This defect in Mr. Leaf's book is not remedied by sporadic references to Schmidt, Wackernagel, or by the citation of Buttmann, valuable, says Mr. Monro, for his "method," or of Döderlein; and still less will any reference to Göbel (twice quoted on p. 149) counterbalance this defect. The writer remembers to have heard the *Althochmeister* himself stigmatize Göbel's volumes as arrogant in their claim of being a continuation of the great *Lexilogus* of Buttmann. Göbel, as everybody knows, is the *bête noire* of every authoritative etymologist.

Inasmuch then as Mr. Leaf's otherwise so admirable work displays no little fondness for outworn conceptions of phonetic law, I think to render best service as a critic by attaching greater prominence to this subject, and beg his kind consideration of some few suggestions that may perhaps be of avail for a second edition; and I have inserted several conjectures of my own as to the formation of certain Homeric words.

A 18: "For *θείος* we ought probably always to read *θείως*, as the word is always found with the last syllable *in arsi*." *θείος* occurs about 75 times in the Iliad and Odyssey, and *θείως* can be read everywhere except 13 times before *αοιδός* in the fifth foot (e. g. α 336, δ 17, θ 47), once (in the second foot) ψ 133, and once before *άνειρος* B 22, where *οὔλος* is, however, a v. l. Mr. Leaf should have alluded to the substitution of *δίος* for *θείος* in his note on B 22 (not B 422, as in Lex. Hom., where other misprints are π 152 (i. e. 252) and σ 116). Cauer and others object strenuously to Nauck's substitution of *δίος*.

A 52: "πυκ (in *ἐχπευκές*) is apparently another form of *πικ*; cf. *πυκκαδανός* by *πικρός*." No such interrelation of radical *ι* and *υ* is accepted at present. *πικρός* belongs to *ποικίλος*, Skt. *péças*, Lat. *pingo*, *piget*; \**πεύκες* in *ἐχπευκές* contains the "strong" root form *πευκ*, which appears in the weak *pug* in Lat. *pungo*.

A 129: *δῶσι* is said to be formed by epenthesis from *δῶσι*, the reading of Zoilus. The reference to Curtius' *Verbum* is the only support that is adduced

for this explanation, which is now antiquated. We are as yet uncertain of the actual termination of the 3. s. subj., and whether the *ι subscriptum* of -ω, -η is from -ωτι, -ωσι, or added to -ωτ from analogy. If σι was added to δῶ, then δῶσι is a development of δῶ, as ἐθέλῃσι from ἐθέλη. See Brugmann, M. U. I. 179 foll., with whom I cannot, however, agree when he regards the epigraphic forms in -η as = ητ.

A 526: "παλινάγρετον from ἀγρέω, which is said to be the Aiolic form of αἰρέω." In another note Mr. Leaf says ἄγρει and ἄγε are probably connected, in which statement he agrees with Anec. Ox. I 117, 27: ἄγε, ὅπερ οἱ Αἰολεῖς ἄγει φασὶ καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ ρ ἄγρει. There is a good deal of confusion here. In the first place, ἄγε can have nothing to do with ἄγρει and ἄγει cannot have become ἄγρει by any πλεονασμός. We have ἀγρέω in the signification of αἰρέω at least four times on Aiolic inscriptions and twice in Sappho. As I do not see that any doubt can be cast upon their connection, I venture to propose the following means of explaining the two forms:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{*ἀ-γῖρέω} \\ \hline \text{αἰρέω Attic.} \quad \text{ἀγρέω, ἄγρημι Aiol.} \\ \text{αἰλέω Cretan.} \end{array}$$

For *ι* as weak vowel cf. the Attic οἰκτῖρω (not οἰκτεῖρω) from \*οἰκτῖρ-γῶ with the *schwa* form in οἰκτρός. ἀ- is the prosthetic vowel to compensate for the weakened root. The spiritus asper in αἰρέω is from analogy to ἔλιν (Φελεῖν or ἐ-Φλεῖν), and the loss of intervocalic γ needs no special proof (e. g. post-Aristotelian ἀγρόχα, Boeot. ἀγείοχα, Tarent. ὀλίος = ὀλγίος, Boeot. ἰών). If ἄγει for ἄγε really existed it may be = ἄγη < ἄγημι. The form looks like a figment of the grammarians, who wished to secure a basis for their explanation of ἄγρει.

B 2. An orange for a norange is cited as a parallel for νήδυμος, a *vox nihili* from -ν ἥδυμος. Cannot our English orange be the representative of Old French *orange* (later *orange*), Ital. *arancia*, the *n* of which has perhaps been dropped through the influence of *aurum*, as Mr. Skeat suggests?

B 308. If Göbel's etymology of φόνος (φοF-ινος) were correct, we might expect at least a sporadic φοῖνός in Homer. I take this occasion of offering an explanation of the troublesome phrase φόνος αἵματος, e. g. II 162 ἐρενογόμενοι φόνον αἵματος. The Lex. Hom. remarks, with appropriateness, that this is *mire dictum*, especially since the translation *Mordblut* (durch *Mord vergossenes Blut*), *blutiger Mord* prevails in Germany. If we notice an unusual signification of the Skt. ghaná (γ'ghven, as in φόνος, θείνω) as "mass," e. g. saindhavaghaná Çat. Br., we have a complete parallel between φόνος and ghaná, and traces of an I.-E. conception.<sup>1</sup>

B 316. I do not see how ἀμφιαχύναν and δίζημαι, γ'ζη, ζη, can be regarded as perfects with the reduplicating vowel *ι*, which belongs *par excellence* to the present. ἀμφιαχύναν is without perfect reduplication. ΦιFάχω is reduplicated in the present, γ'Fāχ.

<sup>1</sup> I subjoin an attempt to explain the difficult word οὐρούς "the launching-ways," a ἀπαξ εἶρ. in Homer (B 153), which cannot, despite Mr. Leaf, be connected with ὀρύσσω, the root of which is ὀρυκ. The shifting of the accentuation of the ground-form Fép-ος to Fep-ός (γ'Fep in Fepνω) necessitated the expulsion of *ε*, and by compensatory prosthesis we obtain δ-Fp-ος, οὐρός. [Or the *ο* may be regarded as = Lesb. *ον*; for the loss of the nasal cf. ἀνέρυσσαν A 459.] This is better than the assumption of a mutation-form \*FopFος (from Fepv-) \*Foppos, Φουρός.

B 413. "πρὶν from the comparative of *πρo, πρo-iv*," savors too much of an apodictic statement, since the Gortynian form *πρεῖν* (VII 40) has not yet been explained.

Δ 138. A reference to Wackernagel's remarks on *είσατο* (*Bezz. Beiträge* IV) might well have been inserted here.

Δ 155. The assertion that *F* can pass into *φ* ought to be more guardedly expressed than Mr. Leaf has done here on *φίλος* < *σφε-ιλος* (which is very doubtful), and on B 144 in reference to *φῆ* < *Fη* (instrumental of *σφο*-).

Δ 315. Wheeler (Nominal Accent, p. 64) reads *δμῶιός*, since it belongs in that class of adjectives which end — *ο υ* and throw the accent on the penult.

Δ 483: "*εἰαμένη* 'lowland,' apparently from root *ās* (*sic!*) ἤς, to sit, for *ἡσαμένη*." If Mr. Leaf does not understand *εἰαμένη* to be = *ἡσαμένη* by an incorrect transcription of *ΕΑΜΕΝΕΙ* (which he does not imply), it would have been instructive had he explained the diphthong of the former form.

Δ 515. On *Τρίτογένεια* cf. Osthoff, M. V. IV 195.

Ε 5. I cannot regard as tenable the assertion of Mr. Leaf that the *-ίνος* of *ὀπωρινός* is to be compared with the *-εινός* of *ποσεινός* and with the *-εννος* of *ἀργεννός* (Aiol.) rather than with the *-ινος* of *φῆγινος*, etc. The fact that no such instance of the reduction of *ει* to *ι* occurs in Homer (as I have attempted to prove in my paper on *ΕΙ* and *Ἰ* in Homer, *Am. Journ. Philol.* VI) surely ought to outweigh the difference of accent, since it can be proved that a shifting of the accent to and from *-ος* occurred in no inconsiderable number of cases.

Ε 194. The unusual contraction in *πρωτοπαγεῖς* should have been noticed; *ζαχρηεῖς* M 347 also is not referred to. The first instance is in so far different from *ἐναργεῖς* η 201, Υ 131, and *ἐπιδευνεῖς* I 225 (Arist. *ἐπιδεύει*), as *πρωτοπαγέες* would not suit the verse; cf. *πρεσβυγενεῖς* Tyrtaeus IV 5. *πρηνεῖς* for *πρηνέες* A 179 is rightly athetized by Mr. Leaf.

Ε 487. Fick conjectured *Ἰάλλοντε*, *i. e.* Aiolic for *Ἰάλουντε*; cf. Goth. *vilvan*.

Ζ 422. That there was a genuine Hellenic inflection *ιος, ια*, is proved by Homeric, Cretan (Gortynian Inscription VII 23) *ιῶ*, and by Homeric, Lesbian and Thessalian *ια*. There is no reason for considering *ιῶ* an analogical formation, since *ια* is not = *μία*, an etymology which Mr. Leaf ought to have considered more than "very doubtful." Cf. *οἶνη*, *οἶνος*, *aëva*, strong forms.

Ζ 507. *θειῶ* is for *\*θέfew*, as asserted by Mr. Leaf (and I believe by Curtius), since a diphthong *ευ* in Aiolic formed by *ef* loses the vocalic element in other dialects, *e. g.* *πνείω* *ρένω* in Aiolic = *πνέω* *ρέω* in Doric and Ionic. *νείω* is both Aiolic and Doro-Ionic, hence it must be for *νεν-ῶ*, yod serving as a protector of the genuine diphthong; if not, then *νείω* is from *νεύσω* by analogy.

Θ 43. *ὕν*, which Mr. Leaf calls the Cyprian form for *σύν* (cf. *ὑγγεμος*· *συλλαβή* Hesychius), is, without question, for *ὕν* = *ἀνά*; cf. *ἰνέθηκε* Collitz 45, 3 Cyprus and *-rv* for *-το* in *εὐφρητάστυ* Dali. 4. Whether Hesychius held that the *ὕν*-of *ὑγγεμος* was = *σύν*, or whether *ἀνά* + *γγεμ* in the Cyprian dialect was the equivalent of *σύν* + *γλαβ* in Attic, is immaterial: that the sibilant of *σύν* should become either the spiritus asper or lenis is utterly impossible. *σίαλος* is for *\*σφίαλος*, otherwise *\*ίαλος* (cf. note on I 208); *ῥς* is not from *σῥς*, as many still suppose, but represents a leveling of the case forms:

Nom. *sūs* = *ῥς*,  
Gen. *suós* = *\*σφός*, *\*σός*,

whence  $\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\sigma\upsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ . Cf. G. Meyer, Gram.<sup>2</sup> p. 221, and Osthoff, M. U. IV 356.

I 203.  $\zeta\omega\rho\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  is generally explained as Martial translates it, "misceri iussit amicis Largius Aeacides *vividiusque* merum"; that is to say, as if from the root  $\zeta\eta$ . Mr. Leaf is not content with this etymology, and suggests  $\chi\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\varsigma$  "to boil." But how does he propose to reach a base  $\zeta\omega$  ( $\zeta\omega\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , Ion.  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\omega$ ,  $\zeta\acute{\omega}\theta\iota$ ) from  $-\acute{\zeta}\epsilon\varsigma$ ?

I 230: " $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}$  ( $\acute{\alpha}\pi.$   $\lambda\epsilon\gamma.$ ) = doubt, for  $\delta F\iota\acute{\eta}$  ( $dva$  = two; cf. *dubius* *Zwei-fel*.)" Many signs and wonders happened in the classical world, but to believe that  $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}$  is from  $\delta F\iota\acute{\eta}$  demands too great credulity on the part of the reader.  $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$  is =  $*\delta F\omicron\iota\acute{o}\varsigma$ , and  $F$  cannot become  $\omicron$ .

I 319.  $F\iota\acute{\alpha}$  is = Skt. *iva* by the not unusual metathesis of  $F$ . This is a most improbable etymology, supported by a reckless contradiction of phonetic law. We should like to see several certain cases of the metathesis of intervocalic  $F$ .

K 462:  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\sigma}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  (*sic*, and not  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\sigma}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ ) is neither so "obscure" a form, nor is the Alcaian  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\epsilon\omega\nu$  necessarily an "imitation" of the Homeric  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\sigma}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ . These are genuine Aiolic forms, the  $-\delta\epsilon$  part being inflected as  $-νε$  in  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\nu}\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  Collitz, D. I. 345, 15,  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\nu}\nu\epsilon\omicron\nu$  345, 17 in the Thessalian dialect,  $-νε$  being equipollent to  $-\delta\epsilon$ ; cf.  $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon$ ,  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon$ . That  $\tau\omicron\iota\acute{\sigma}\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  is an Aiolic form is the more probable, since  $-\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , with but a very few MS exceptions, is the dat.-loc. ending of the article alone in the Aiolic dialect, and  $-\omicron\iota\sigma\iota$  the Aiolic substantival and adjectival termination.

K 466. Is it not an inversion of the facts, as regards Greek grammar at least, to speak of  $\delta\epsilon F$  (in  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega$ ) as the *lengthened* form of the root  $\delta\epsilon$ ?

$\Delta$  184: " $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$ , a lengthened form of  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}$ ," is not an incorrect, though a jejune statement. If we compare Hom.  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$   $\Delta$  66, Cyprian  $\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}$  (Hesychius  $\sigma\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}$ ) with  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\eta}$ , it is evident that we have here a case of anaptyxis. The forms with  $\omicron$  are probably Aiolic.

$\Delta$  201: "The  $\nu$  of  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$  seems to represent the  $m$  of I.-E.  $t\acute{u}bhyam$ , the  $\delta h$  being dropped"(!). We hope Mr. Leaf will excuse our seeming *brutalité*, but this is a statement savoring of the days of Benfey or of Pott's youth, and completely at variance with the fixed laws of comparative grammar.

$\Delta$  697. I have attempted, in VI 436 of the Am. Journ. of Phil., to explain the seemingly anomalous  $\epsilon$  of  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\lambda}\eta\eta\sigma\iota$  ( $\Delta$  205) *in thesi*, and to refute the arguments of Hartel, whose opinion that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\acute{\iota}$  ( $\Delta$  86) contains a trace of the primitive quantity of the dative is shared by Mr. Monro and by Mr. Leaf. (See the latter's note on  $\Delta$  86.)

M 208. The scansion of  $\delta\phi\iota\nu$  as a trochee at the end of the verse is ascribed by Mr. Leaf to the power of the ictus alone. We find, however, a number of examples in prose ( $\Pi\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  CIA III 1012, and  $\Pi\iota\theta\acute{o}\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\chi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  Hesych.,  $\delta\epsilon\delta\acute{o}\kappa\chi\theta\alpha\iota$  Cauer<sup>2</sup> 510, 26) which represent the transitional stage between the aspirated *tenuis* and the spirant. If  $\acute{\iota}\phi\iota\varsigma$  is therefore =  $\delta\pi\phi\iota\varsigma$ , to the pronunciation at the time of the composition of this line, rather than to the ictus, is to be ascribed a quantity that might, it is true, be explained by the ictus alone. We are glad to note that Mr. Leaf is a believer in the traditional theory of ictus-lengthening (see his notes on E 31, 203, 293,  $\Gamma$  240, K 280, 285), though he nowhere defines his exact position in regard to this mooted question. When,

as in the case of ῥόφης, another explanation may serve to account for an apparent metrical irregularity, is it not better to have recourse to it than to increase the number of cases of a metrical phenomenon that must at best have been regarded in the light of a license? Since Mr. Leaf has gone so far as to suggest that σπείο (for σπέο) in K 285 is a bold case of lengthening by the ictus, I am surprised that a similar explanation did not suggest itself to him in writing the note on H 340, a passage famous for its difficulty:

ἐν δ' αὐτοῖσι πύλας ποιήσομεν ἐν ἄραρυίας,  
ᾧρα δι' αὐτῶν ἱππηλασίη ὁδὸς εἴη.

The MSS have εἴη, G. Hermann εἶη. A certain case of this form of the subjunctive of εἰμί is said to occur in Ψ 47, ᾧρα ζωοῖσι μετείω, and "possible" instances are I 245 ἡμῖν δὲ δὴ αἰσιμον εἴη, Σ 88 ἵνα καὶ σοὶ πένθος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μυρίον εἴη, ρ 586 ὥς περ ἂν εἴη. Mr. Leaf is quite correct in stating that εἴη cannot be formed from ῥέης unless we hold to Christ's as yet unaccepted suggestion that there is a subj. termination -ιω corresponding to Doric futures like κρυψίω and to the Skt. future. G. Meyer, Gramm.<sup>2</sup> §583, declares the diphthong of μετείω to be *unerklärlich*. In my treatise on the Diphthong EI I hazarded the conjecture that we have here simply a case of the ictus-lengthening of μετέω, which actually occurs, X 388, ζωοῖσιν μετέω, or perhaps an incorrect transcription of METEO by some one who did not know that occasionally this license of the lengthening of an antevocalic vowel was permitted. A genuine εἰ this cannot be. Other possible examples of this lengthening are μαχείομενος ρ 471, ἀκειόμενον, and perhaps κυκειῶ (and the ἄπαξ λεγ. Θρήῖκες?).

M 337. G. Meyer appears to have abandoned his explanation of βῶσαντι from βοF + σαντι and to have accepted the unusual contraction; cf. Gramm.<sup>2</sup> §141.

This edition is a beautiful example of the printer's art, and is singularly free from typographical errors. Should the note on A 26 not have contained a reference to H 340 rather than to H 439, and is not λαῖνον Γ 57 (not in La R.) a misprint?

We beg leave to record our opinion that Mr. Leaf's edition is a most substantial addition to English scholarship.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

Amis and Amiloun zugleich mit der altfranzösischen Quelle, herausgegeben von E. KÖLBING. Nebst einer Beilage: Amicus ok Amilius Rímur. cxxxi, 256 pp. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1884.

Octavian, zwei mittelenglische Bearbeitungen der Sage, herausgegeben von GREGOR SARRAZIN. xlv, 191 pp. Heilbronn, Gebr. Henninger, 1885.

These two works form the second and third volumes of the Altenglische Bibliothek, edited by Professor E. Kölbing, the first volume of which was Osbern Bokenam's Legenden, edited by C. Horstmann (1883), and the annual continuations, so far as announced, will be the Ancren Riwele (1886), Arthour and Merlin (1887), and the Ormulum (1888), all to be edited by E. Kölbing. This is an excellent scheme, and we are grateful to Professor Kölbing for the fruits of the zeal with which he is devoting himself to the study of Middle-English literature, and especially the making accessible at moderate price of such